

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, at page 2, claim 7 was rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 due to insufficient antecedent basis for the recited limitation "the nonvolatile." Claim 7 depends from claim 6, which in part recites, "wherein the memory is a nonvolatile memory." Therefore, there is sufficient antecedent basis in claim 6 for the limitation "the nonvolatile," as recited in claim 7. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, at page 2, claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cleveland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,583 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed to the extent it would apply to claims 1, 3, and 8 as amended.

Cleveland et al. does not discuss or suggest a write error protect circuit including "a register, a first gate that sets one of a first data and a second data supplied from outside into the register; and a second gate that disables output of the write signal to the memory when the register is reset, outputs the write signal to the memory when the first data is set into the register, and prevents the output of the write signal to the memory when the second data is set into the register," as recited in amended independent claims 1, 3, and 8. In other words, the register, first gate, and second gate circuit elements of the write error protect circuit of claims 1, 3, and 8 are not provided in the write protect block of Cleveland et al., as relied upon by the Examiner in col. 12, lines 13-60 and col. 13, lines 7-24 of Cleveland et al., and as shown in Fig. 3 of Cleveland et al.

Claims 5-7 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 3 and include all the features of claim 3, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 5-7 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above.

Claims 10-13 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 8 and include all the features of claim 8, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 10-13 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 102(b) rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

July 13, 2006

By:

Paul I. Kravetz

Paul I. Kravetz
Registration No. 35,230

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501